

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/971,099 | 10/03/2001 | Cynthia C. Bamdad | M01015/70066 TJO | 2127 |
| 7590 06/01/2006 | | | EXAM | INER |
| JHK Law | | | DO, PENSEE T | |
| P.O. Box 1078 La Canada, CA 91012-1078 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| La Canada, Cr | 1 71012 1070 | | 1641 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| • | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 09/971,099 | BAMDAD, CYNTHIA C. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Pensee T. Do | 1641 | | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| Period fo | · - | (IC CET TO EVOIDE AMONTH! | C) OD TUIDTY (20) DAYS | | | | |
| WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)[🖂 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ja | nuary 2006. | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3)□ | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)🖂 | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13-18,20-29,35,36 and 39-43</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| · | 5) Claim(s) <u>22-29,40 and 41</u> is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| • | 6) Claim(s) <u>13-18, 20-21, 35, 36, 42, 43</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | r election requirement | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Applicat | ion Papers | | | | | | |
| • | The specification is objected to by the Examine | | | | | | |
| 10) | 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| · | | armici. Note the addition of one | 7.0.0.7.0.7.0.7.7. | | | | |
| • | under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| | 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) | a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | • • | | | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | |
| 3) 🔲 Infor | mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date | | atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment Entry & Claim status

The amendment filed on January 11, 2006 has been acknowledged and entered. Claims 13-18, 20-29, 35, 36, 39-43 are pending.

Withdrawn Rejection(s)

Since Applicants have cancelled all previously rejected claims, all art rejections in the previous office actions are withdrawn herein.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13-21, 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 is indefinite for reciting "the first article being immobilized relative to a signaling entity that is immobilized relative to a binding partner". The binding partner is already linked to a first agent and a nanoparticle being linked to a binding partner.

Where else on the binding partner would a signaling entity bind? Where is the signaling entity with respect to the nanoparticle and the first agent?

Also, claim 13 is indefinite because it is unclear whether the signaling entity is the same as or different from the nanoparticle.

Application/Control Number: 09/971,099

Art Unit: 1641

Claim 13 is also confusing about the purpose of magnetically drawing the second article and subsequently releasing it.

Claim 13 is also unclear of how the first and the second location are differed in order to distinguish which location has the first article from which location has the second article.

Claim 13 fails to recite a device or a surface that contains the first and the second locations. Such device is important to the method of the claim because it is the device, presumably, which determines which location has the first and which location has the second article in order to carry out the releasing step or the separation step.

Claim 17 is indefinite for reciting "predetermined surface areas", which have not been recited or introduced in the independent claim 13, or claims 15 and 16. It is unclear that whether the predetermined surface areas are the same as the first and second locations.

Claim 39 is indefinite for being dependent from a cancelled claim 38.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-18, 20, 21 and 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure, which is not enabling. A step of determining whether the nanoparticles are present in first and second locations after magnetically drawing the first and second articles to the first and second locations is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled

Application/Control Number: 09/971,099

Art Unit: 1641

by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). The specification, page 13, lines 7-24, describes that "Pools of drug-presenting" magnetic beads are then mixed with colloids that present both the target molecules and an electronic label. The solution is retained over an array of microelectrodes. A magnetic field can be separately applied to each electrode in the array to attract magnetic beads. The array is then electronically analyzed (ACV preferred). Pads that register a positive, indicate that, at that address/location, a drug candidate on a magnetic bead has captured a target molecule on a signaling colloid. The magnetic field at spatial addresses that registered a positive remain "turned on", while the other magnetic fields are released, and an exit valve is opened to wash away magnetic bead...". (emphasis added). However, the claims fail to recite such step of electronically analyzing the nanoparticle/colloids on the magnetic particles after magnetically attracting the magnetic beads to the surface of the locations. Without such step recited in the claim, it would be impossible to distinguish the first articles from the second articles because these article both contain magnetic particles which would attract to the surface or locations that were applied with a magnetic field. The differential component between the first and second articles is the nanoparticles on the first article. Thus, one would take advantage of such nanoparticles/signaling entity in order to distinguish the first article from the second article.

Page 4

Remarks

Claims 13-18, 20-29, 35, 36 and 39-43 are free of prior arts as now recited.

Application/Control Number: 09/971,099 Page 5

Art Unit: 1641

Claims 22-29, 40 and 41 are allowable. However, during the telephonic conversations with Dr. Kim held on May 12 and May 24, the Applicants have refused to resolve minor issues of claims 22-29, 40 and 41 to place these claims in conditions of allowance and cancel all other pending claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pensee T. Do whose telephone number is 571-272-0819. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pensee T. Do Patent Examiner May 24, 2006

LONG V. LE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

05/26/06